FEB 18 PAGE 15

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
JAN 18 2000
CLERK

No. 99-1051

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

SANDRA LEA BENEDICT,
Petitioner,

v.

EAU CLAIRE PUBLIC SCHOOLS, WEAC LABOR UNION, THOMAS GUELZOW, GEORGE SENTENEY, VICTOR ARELLANO, THOMAS ARNOT, and JOHN FINNERTY
Respondents.

ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI
TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT

BRIEF IN OPPOSITION TO PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

DOUGLAS M. JOHNSON *
GARVEY, ANDERSON, JOHNSON, GERACI & MIRR, S.C.
204 EAST GRAND AVENUE
P.O. BOX 187
EAU CLAIRE, WI 54702-0187
(715) 834-3425

* *Counsel of Record for Respondents Thomas Guelzow and George Senteney*

BECKER GALLAGHER LEGAL PUBLISHING, INC.,
CINCINNATI, OHIO 800-890-5001

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ARGUMENT

Thomas Guelzow and George Senteney (hereinafter the "Respondents") respectfully request that this Court deny Sandra Benedict's Petition for Writ of Certiorari (hereinafter the "Petition"). Benedict has failed to identify any Constitutional issues that were decided in favor of Respondents and against Benedict by either the United States District Court for the Western District of Wisconsin (hereinafter the "District Court") or the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit (hereinafter the "Seventh Circuit").

Benedict has consistently failed to allege any claims against the Respondents or argue any relevant issues with respect to the Respondents. Benedict's original District Court complaint failed to contain any allegations of wrongdoing by the Respondents. Nowhere in her complaint did Benedict allege any intentional, negligent or improper conduct that could form the basis of a federal action against the Respondents. Accordingly, the District Court dismissed Benedict's complaint against Respondents for failure to state a claim.

On appeal, Benedict's opening brief in the Seventh Circuit contained no argument relating to the District Court's dismissal of the Respondents. (*See* Seventh Circuit's Order, dated August 23, 1999, attached to Benedict's Petition at App. 1-4). By failing to include arguments against the Respondents in her opening brief, the Seventh Circuit held that Benedict had forfeited any objection to the dismissal of the Respondents. *Id.*

Both the District Court and the Seventh Circuit have ordered sanctions against Benedict for filing frivolous, voluminous, illogical and incomprehensible documents. Benedict's Petition is just more of the same.

CONCLUSION

Respondents, Thomas Guelzow and George Senteney, respectfully request that this Court deny Benedict's Petition.

Dated at Eau Clare, Wisconsin this 18 day of January, 2000.

/s/_____

Douglas M. Johnson
Counsel of Record for Thomas Guelzow
and George Senteney
Garvey, Anderson, Johnson,
Geraci & Mirr, S.C.
204 East Grand Avenue
P.O. Box 187
Eau Clare, WI 54702-0187
(715) 834-3425